DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 995 HE 000 211

By-Cross, K. Patricia
Students' Education of One Another.
California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
Pub Date 68
Note-4p.; Article in The Research Reporter; v3 n2 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.30
Descriptors-*Cocurricular Activities, *Higher Education, *Interests, Interest Tests, *Learning, Research, *Students

The separation between the classroom and extracurricular activities of students has long been recognized by educational reformers. Much fundamental learning occurs outside the classroom. As part of an overall longitudinal research project to determine the sources of impact on the lives of students as they develop or fail to develop in line with their initially assessed potentialities, a discussionaire was administered to freshmen in 5 diverse colleges in Spring 1967. Consisting of 120 possible topics for discussion, it asked students to state how often during the past year they had discussed the topic with persons their own age. Analysis of the top 10 topics for each campus shows that some topics are frequently discussed on all campuses, some are unique to particular campuses, and others are related to the sex of the respondent. The Vietnam war was of major concern to students on all campuses, but the 1 topic that ranked among the top 10 on every campus for men and on 3 out of 5 for women was the "state's governor and policies." On the Negro campus surveyed, there was considerable disparity between the conversations of men and women, though on other campuses, interests of women tended to parallel those of men. Most students tended to talk about subjects that directly concerned them rather than about broad social issues. (JS)

ED025995

STUDENTS' EDUCATION OF ONE ANOTHER

by

K. Patricia Cross

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 000 211

Students' Education of One Another

"The most important single factor in a modern liberal education is the education which students receive from one another."

JAMES B. CONANT

"The real intellectual life of a body of undergraduates, if there be any, manifests itself, not in the classroom, but in what they do and talk of and set before themselves as their favorite objects between classes and lectures. You will see the true life of a college where youths get together and let themselves go upon their favorite themes . . ."

WOODROW WILSON

That these two statements were made over half a century apart is not as remarkable as the fact that they were made by two men recognized as scholars and leaders in educational reform. For the educational reformer would seem to have little hope of influencing the "education which students receive from one another," and the scholar would appear reluctant to leave the "real intellectual life of a body of undergraduates" to students.

Wilson, the scholar, felt that the students could not by themselves sustain the intellectual life of the college, and Wilson, the reformer, set about the notably difficult task of changing the things students "set before themselves as their favorite objects between classes and lectures." His prescription for increasing the effectiveness of the colleges of the early 1900's was revealed in his observation that,

*"So long as instruction and life do not merge in our colleges, so long as what the undergraduates do and what they are taught occupy two separate airtight compartments in their consciousness, so long will the college be ineffectual."**

There is now considerable research support for Wilson's contention, and the goal appears as desirable (and perhaps as far away) as it did at the turn of the century. Sixty years ago, however, men like Wilson and Lowell, then presidents of Princeton and Harvard, struggled to bring the extracurriculum closer to the intellectual efforts of the faculty. They fought vigorously against the dominance of the "sideshows" of the campus—the social life of the clubs, the emphasis upon athletics, and the Joe College attitudes of students and alumni. While the separation between the classroom and the extracurricular activities of students may be as great as ever, today's gap exists for quite different reasons. The interests of students are changing so rapidly that some college administrators and faculty members find themselves wishing for the old days when the essentially nonintellectual interests of students, while not supporting the curriculum, at least did not interfere with it. And yet, this very interference may be one of the hopeful signs that college instruction and life are beginning to merge. Unlike Wilson and Lowell who called for the reform of the extracurricular, educational leaders today are calling for curricular reform, and students are asking that their college classes be made relevant to the concerns of individuals in an increasingly complex society.

If we take seriously—and we can't afford not to—the claims that much of the fundamental education of the student occurs outside of the classroom, what is it that students are learning today? One of the ongoing research projects at the Center throws some light on this question.

In the spring of 1967, a discussionnaire was administered to freshmen in five diverse colleges. The instrument consisted of 120 possible topics for discussion and asked students to state how often, during the past year, they had talked about the topic with persons of their own age. An index of the frequency with which various topics were discussed made it possible to rank the importance of each topic on the various campuses. The purpose of the overall longitudinal reseach project, under the direction of Paul Heist and Joanne Floyd, is to determine the sources of impact on the lives of students as they develop or fail to develop in line with their initially assessed potentialities. The discussionaire data represent only a small segment of the longitudinal study, which is scheduled for completion in 1970.

An analysis of the topics which ranked among the top ten for each campus shows that some topics are discussed with great frequency on all campuses, some are unique to a particular campus, and still others are related to the sex of the respondent. It is not surprising that the Vietnam war was of major concern to young people on all campuses, but the one topic that ranked among the top ten on *every* campus for men and on three of the five campuses for women was the "state's

*Wilson, W. The Spirit of Learning, (1909) In *Selected Literary and Political Papers and Addresses of Woodrow Wilson,* Vol. I, New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1925.

governor and policies." Four of the five campuses in the study are located in California (Ronald Reagan, governor) and one in Georgia (Lester Maddox, governor).

Discussion of the Vietnam war ranked very high for both men and women on the California campuses, but relatively low for the Negro college in Georgia, where concern with civil rights displaced other possible conversational topics for the men. Of considerable interest is the disparity on the Negro campus between the conversations of men and women. Whereas many of the top ten topics for discussion among the men were related to civil rights (black power, segregation, Stokely Carmichael, the state's governor, and the like), the subject did not appear among the top ten topics for discussion among the women. Rather the women tended to emphasize matters of personal concern, such as clothes, personal appearance, future family life, and vocational plans. Civil rights issues were relegated to the second echelon of discussion topics, but even so, black power, Martin Luther King, and the Supreme Court decisions rated more discussion among the women in the Negro college than among either men or women on any of the other campuses. The extreme variation of the frequency with which racial problems were discussed from campus to campus is illustrated by the fact that the most frequently discussed topic concerned with civil rights was ranked second and 11th by the men and women respectively on the Negro campus, 13th and 11th on the campus of a large highly selective predominately white state university campus, 37th and 23rd on an equally selective state university campus, and 40th and 48th at a small less selective church-related college. Furthermore, the highest ranking racial issue on the Negro campus for both men and women was an item which read, "black power, Stokely Carmichael, Adam Clayton Powell, Harlem, Watts, Malcolm X, equality," whereas on the predominately white campuses, it was "segregation, discrimination, Supreme Court decisions upholding civil rights, equality."

Another topic showing unusual inter-campus range was "marijuana," which ranked third and first for men and women respectively on one campus, and did not even make the top 50 topics on another campus. Except on the one campus, however, young people did not appear to do a lot of talking about marijuana, and LSD was rarely discussed. The subject of "nonconforming youth of the current generation (the new left, hippies, teenyboppers, radicals, etc.)" was a popular conversational topic at all colleges with the exception of the Negro college, where at least 50 other topics rated more attention.

On most campuses, the interests of women tended to parallel those of men. There were some items, however, which were distinctly sex-related. Most prominent among these was the draft. The discussionnaire presented the topic as two separate items. One, listed under the heading of national affairs, read: "conscription (the draft)—as a national and not a personal issue." The other item appeared under the heading of personal and intellectual-aesthetic affairs and read: "conscription (the draft)—as a personal concern and not a national issue." On all five campuses, *both* definitions appeared among the 15 most frequently discussed topics for

men. Women, on the other hand, tended to rank discussions of the draft in the 30's.

Other topics which showed considerable variation between the sexes were those related to sex, morality, love, and so forth. On four of the five campuses, women rank "love" and "interpersonal morality—sexual" among the 15 topics most frequently discussed. Men, generally, found at least 30 topics on which they spent more time. Neither men nor women spent much time taking about virginity or "the pill," but as might be expected, women ranked these topics somewhat higher than did men.

Both men and women gave only moderate attention to the discussion of education. Of the six items presented under the heading of Educational Affairs, "academic freedom and free speech of students" received the most attention, whereas the "academic freedom and free speech of the faculty" received the least—no nominations for the top 15 items on any campus. The remaining four items, which were concerned with the quality of education, the philosophy of education, the role of students and faculty in governance, and authority in education, appeared among the top 15 items in a scattered pattern on one or two campuses.

The subjects that students are not talking about contain more surprises, in many ways, than the topics they are discussing. On none of the campuses were students discussing "poverty and the Poverty Program" to any extent. Neither were they talking about "crime" or urban blight, slums, etc." Although these topics were, perhaps, not as much in the limelight a year ago as they are today, they certainly were of sufficient concern to become major issues in the presidential campaigns. And they were not listed among the top 50 conversational topics on any of the five campuses for either men or women as late as the spring of 1967. To many, who claim that this generation of students is more selfless than previous generations, it will be disappointing to learn that they, like

generations before them, tend to talk about the subjects which affect them directly. Men are more concerned than women about the draft, Negroes more concerned than whites with civil rights, students more concerned about their academic freedom than the academic freedom of faculty, and middle class college students less concerned about poverty than might seem indicated.

Nevertheless, the interests of students undoubtedly have changed since Wilson's day. While it is difficult to conceive of merging the classroom experience with the nonintellectual interests of the students of earlier eras, today's student concerns with social and political issues present an appropriate educational challenge. When the "education which students receive from one another" and that which they receive in the classroom serve as complementary forces, then the college experience may become an effective force in the development of future leaders for an increasingly complex society.

K. PATRICIA CROSS

College and University: Agents of Social Change?

Increasingly, members of college and university communities and the public are involving the campus in sensitive political and social issues. Many would like colleges and universities to take direct action to bring about social change. Others assert that the proper role of institutions of higher education is to provide an arena for discussion of the issues not as an advocate of a given line of action. The fundamental question of the future role of institutions of higher education as change agents in society sparked lively discussion at the 10th Annual College and University Self-Study Institute co-sponsored by the Center and Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education on July 8 through 11.

The program, College and University as Agents of Social Change, was designed to provide "an arena for thoughtful discussion on alternatives and consequences in light of different assumptions about the nature and purpose of the college and university." Nearly 100 college presidents, members of their staffs, department chairmen, key members of the faculty, and representatives of student organizations participated in the four-day event.

Participants discussed questions within the framework of a background paper prepared by T. R. McConnell, entitled "College and university as agents of social change: An introduction." He suggested that " ' the ivory tower' is an outmoded figure. The question is not whether the university has an obligation for public service. The question is whether the college or university should serve as an instrument of direct social action."

Major addresses were delivered by Kenneth E. Boulding, professor of economics, University of Colorado; Algo Henderson of the Center; Roger Heyns, chancellor, University of California at Berkeley; Eldon Johnson, vice president, University of Illinois; and Harris L. Wofford, president, State University College, Old Westbury, New York.

Proceedings will be available in November from either the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Special Programs in Higher Education, University East Campus, 30th Street, Boulder, Colorado 80302 or the Center for research and Development in Higher Education, 1947 Center Street, Berkeley, California 94720.

Center-NASPA Conference Brings Research and Practice Together

Education of the "whole man" has long given lip service by college and university educators. Yet research in higher education is just beginning to suggest the processes and factors involved in the total education of college students. And a gap still exists between research knowledge and educational practice.

Closing the gap between what we know and what we do about student development was the aim of the workshop conference on Innovative Programs for Student Development sponsored by the Center and the Division on Professional Development and Standards of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). The four-day event held from June 30 to July 4 in Berkeley brought together research specialists and college student personnel administrators to design innovative programs for student development, informed by research findings. The participants —the majority of whom were vice presidents, deans of students, and deans of men or women—represented 85 institutions in 31 states and Canada.

Under the leadership of codirectors Allen W. Rogers, associate dean of student activities at Indiana State University, and Thomas McLeod, assistant dean of men at the University of Alabama, the conference was designed to combine theory and practice. Participants heard presentations of research on student development by Center staff members. Warren B. Martin spoke on "The development of innovation: Making reality change"; David Whittaker discussed "Student subculture reviewed and revisited"; and Mary Regan presented "Student change: The new student and society." Senior deans from NASPA, who presented reactions to the Center's research data, focused upon the implications for student personnel programs.

Workshop participants then worked in teams to design programs for three existing institutions which were represented by administrative teams, consisting of the president, vice president for academic affairs, and the director of the budget. Thus, the innovators were encouraged to place their plans in the context of "real world" institutions by these experienced college administrators who served as consultants throughout the workshop.

For example, one innovative team noted in the particular institution they studied a need for "a clear channel for student and faculty input into university policy formation and decision making." To meet the need at this institution, the innovative team proposed establishment of a University Planning and Review Commission composed of administration, faculty, and student members (with the latter groups in majority). Serving in a staff relationship to the president and dean of the faculties, the commission's first task would be to "continue study of the role and scope of the institution, to participate in the redefinition of its educational goals, and the restatement of the institutional objectives, and, in general, to assist the president, dean, and faculty in their continuing institutional self-study."

After cooperating in team efforts to develop a program for one of the three colleges described at the conference, participants faced the task of designing a proposal for their own campuses. Resource persons available were Center consultants, NASPA workshop faculty, top administative officers from the three colleges, and fellow workshop participants.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Following are recent books and monographs by Center authors. Titles not published by the Center are obtainable through the publishers.

Cross, K. Patricia. *The junior college student: A research description.* Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968. ($1.00)

A synthesis of recent research on characteristics of junior college students, discussed under the following heading: Academic characteristics, socioeconomic background, finances, self-concepts, interests and personality, reasons for attending college, choice of vocation and major field of study, and educational and occupational aspirations.

Gott, Richard. *Junior college into four-year college: Rationale and result in two institutions.* Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1968. ($2.00)

A study of two junior colleges which extended into four-year colleges. Seeks to determine to what extent the two-year function continues to be performed within the four-year college setting. Identifies factors that seem to militate for and against continuation of these funtions.

Heist, Paul A. (Ed.) *The creative college student: An unmet challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968. ($7.75)

An investigation of the loss of creative students from colleges and universities in the United States, raising questions about the reasons for withdrawal of this type of student and revealing failures and inadequacies in many college curricula relevant to the education of talented and creative students.

Henderson, Algo D. (Ed.) *Higher education in tomorrow's world.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1968. ($3.50)

A symposium of 20 educators, representing 14 countries, discussing problems and goals of higher education from the points of view of their varying cultures and needs. Subtopics are devoted to students, health, cultural and economic advance, civic and occupational competencies, and the resolution of intercultural and value system conflicts.

Trent, James W., and Medsker, Leland L. *Beyond high school: A psychosociological study of 10,000 high school graduates.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968. ($10.00)

A study following 10,000 high school graduates for four years through patterns of work, college, and marriage. It investigates the high school graduates' progress in work and college, their evaluation of this progress, and factors related to withdrawal from college. The primary focus is on the impact of college versus employment on change of values and attitudes.

The Research Reporter

The Research Reporter is published quarterly by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1947 Center Street, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720

LELAND L. MEDSKER, *Director*

K. PATRICIA CROSS, *Editor*

WILSON SCHOOLEY, *Managing Editor*

FROM THE EDITOR

This issue of the *Research Reporter* is one of a series reporting on the activities of the Center. The *Reporter* is written primarily for those who are directly concerned with the practice of higher education. Our goal is to report the results of research and study in higher education, focusing upon the implications for educational practice. We shall attempt to keep you posted on the on-going studies, the completion of research projects, and the publications issued from the Center.

The *Research Reporter* will be sent without charge to those who ask to be placed on the mailing list. We welcome your comments and reactions.

6-9-68

THE CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION
1947 CENTER STREET
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

Nonprofit Org.
U. S. Postage
PAID
Berkeley, Calif.
Permit No. 1